



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,403	04/18/2001	Thomas J. Kennedy III	P-5907 SLD 2 0236	7628

24492 7590 06/25/2003

THE TOP-FLITE GOLF COMPANY  
425 MEADOW STREET  
PO BOX 901  
CHICOPEE, MA 01021-0901

EXAMINER

BUTTNER, DAVID J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1712

DATE MAILED: 06/25/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/837,403

Applicant(s)

KENNEDY ET AL.

Examiner

David Buttner

Art Unit

1712

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: eliminating "terephthalic acid" and adding "consisting essentially of" is new issue.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-31.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 11.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The petition has not been decided. The examiner is not permitted to delay the office action.

"Isophthalic acid" is not "phthalic acid" according to applicant's own specification (page 6). The three compounds each have distinct structures. "Phthalic acid" is not generic to the others. The fact that some in the art may consider "phthalic acid" to encompass the others is of no consequence because applicant chose to clearly define the terms otherwise. Applicant is "stuck" with his specification's original definition. Oddly, if "phthalic acid" was generic to all three isomers, then the newly proposed claims would still be met by references utilizing polyamides of terephthalic acid.

Regarding claim 30, an "acrylate" is an unsaturated compound. A "polymer of an acrylate" no longer contains any unsaturation. The Specification adds polymers of acrylates - not acrylates.

Applicant argues the ionomers of Rajagopalan '862 do not qualify as applicant's ionomers. This is not convincing as applicant's claims have no constraints on the ionomer. Arguments regarding the terephthalic based polyamides of the other references would be relevant only if the proposed amdt had been entered...

DAVID J. BUTTNER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*David Buttner*